A U M

The perfect sage does not seek to take and remake the empire. He does not seek to enforce his own ideas upon it, but is content to give up extravagant comforts and indulgent egoism himself and thus to set the nation an example of returning to simplicity.
—LAO TZE.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXVII December, 1938 No. 2

THE SECRET PATH

The path which is not manifest is with difficulty attained by corporeal beings.—BHAGAVAD-GITA.

IN the early days of the Movement H. P. Blavatsky made it quite clear that becoming a theosophist does not involve the acceptance of any doctrine or tenet. This is stated explicitly in her article, "What are the Theosophists?" published in *The Theosophist* for October, 1879, where, in answer to the question, In what does the Society believe, she said: "*As a body*—nothing." A study of the three Objects of the original society establishes the same position, for the First presents the ideal of Brotherhood, irrespective of beliefs, and the Second and Third describe the kind of research to be pursued, without any reference to the conclusions that may be reached through such study.

What, then, does Theosophy teach? Has it no doctrines, no systematic philosophy? Said H. P. B.:

> The Society, as a body, has no creed, as creeds are but the shells around spiritual knowledge; and Theosophy in its fruition is spiritual knowledge itself—the very essence of philosophical and theistic enquiry.

It was the spirit of philosophical and theistic *enquiry* in the "True Theosophists in every Country and of every Race," that caused *The Secret Doctrine* to be written, "for they called it forth, and for them it was recorded." In that work H. P. B. gathered together the oldest tenets of the great Asiatic and early European religions and made of them one harmonious and unbroken whole. As to its *acceptance,* she wrote: "It claims consideration, not by reason of any appeal to dogmatic Authority, but because it closely adheres to Nature, and follows the laws of uniformity and analogy."

There is the axiom, "Live the life and ye shall know the doctrine," suggesting that knowledge is not to be found in books. Yet we have, and study books. What is the meaning of the paradoxical

teaching which enjoins the reading of scripture, yet holds out the ideal of "high indifference as to those doctrines which are already taught or which are yet to be taught"?

Somewhere, beyond the portals of this mystery, runs the Path of the Unmanifested. There is the aspirant, there is the doctrine, and there is the great Objective, but the dynamic relationship of these three cannot be described. "Perform the duties of daily life," says one. "The truth is not alone beyond, but hidden in the commonplace as well." Believing, but not *knowing* this, the disciples become industrious, thrifty, orderly in their lives, and that is all. "Strive toward the Golden Age that is to come," exclaims another, and men seek out their fellows in the highways and byways, to tell of this high hope, while the villages of these enthusiasts fall into disorder and their hearths grow cold. "Retire, and seek divinity within," advises a third, and meanwhile forest consumes the fields; the multitude, left without guides, is beguiled by desire.

A Teacher is a prism through which the light of Truth has become manifest. The minds of disciples are also prisms, but clouded by desire and ignorance, their planes distorted by selfishness. The lens of soul must be ground to symmetry as well as burnished by assiduous study. Otherwise the light is obliquely refracted and its brilliance leads away from, not toward, the path of the unmanifested.

The animal cannot distinguish self from the bodily form. This is the characteristic of animal intelligence. Man fails to differentiate between his mental states and the thinker, and becomes therefore the victim of those states. Until the seeker looks within not merely his body, but his mind, and learns to recognize his own obliquity of thought, he will continue to be self-deluded, the entrance to the path remain dark and hidden. Theosophy is the essential truth which lies behind all forms, even forms of thought. The "body" of ideas with which the Teacher clothes the principles of things is itself a structure—external to the student until he builds his own inner metaphysical habitation. This is what is meant by "application." The guide on the path of the unmanifested is, and will always remain, the Voice of the Silence.

GREAT THEOSOPHISTS

Thomas Paine

On January 29, 1737, a son was born to Joseph Paine, a humble staymaker living in Thetford, England. A great soul had come into incarnation; one who in the coming years would help call the American nation into being and draft a Bill of Rights for the yet unborn French Republic; who would suffer ignominy and imprisonment, be denounced for a century, and finally rise triumphant as one of the emancipators of the human race. Such was the destiny of Thomas Paine, and today three great nations claim him as a distinguished citizen and refer with pride to his achievements.

From his earliest childhood Thomas Paine rebelled against man's inhumanity to man, as he saw it demonstrated in the stocks, pillory and gallows which he passed every morning on his way to school. The first pamphlet he ever wrote was a plea to the British Parliament in behalf of the overworked and underpaid excisemen whose lot he shared. This compassionate spirit made his mind host to two classes of thoughts—those he produced in himself by reflection and the act of thinking, and "those that bolt into the mind of their own accord." He called the latter his "voluntary visitors" and admitted that he was indebted to them for all the knowledge he had.

Were these thoughts injected into Paine's mind by certain Adepts who were concerned with the awakening of freedom destined to take place in the last quarter of the eighteenth century? Knowing that a new order of ages was due to commence, they sought a mind through which the needed reaction in America might be produced, and found it in Thomas Paine. They presented these ideas to Paine in the form of a vision. As he described it:

> I saw, or at least I thought I saw, a vast scene opening itself to the world in the affairs of America, and it appeared to me that unless the Americans changed the plan they were pursuing with respect to the government of England, and declared themselves independent, they would shut out the prospect that was then offering itself to mankind through their means.

This vision made such an impression upon Thomas Paine that he left England and came to America. This visit resulted in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the birth of the American nation.

Evidence that the founding of the American Republic was sponsored by Adepts is seen in the Great Seal of the United States. On the reverse side of this Seal is a pyramid with the capstone removed, its space occupied by a blazing eye set in a triangle. At the top of the Seal appear the words "The heavens approve," while at the bottom is the prophetic sentence, "A new order of ages."

Thomas Paine arrived in America on November 30, 1774. He went at once to Philadelphia, and shortly afterward became the editor of the *Pennsylvania Journal.* He found the country greatly upset by oppression and unrest. One of his first articles in the *Journal* was written in defense of the negro slaves, urging their emancipation. Had his warning been heeded, the Civil War would not have occurred. This was followed by a protest against cruelty to animals and by the first plea for women's rights ever published in America.

In 1775 the American Colonies were still acting as separate units and with no thought of secession from Great Britain. George Washington was still a loyal British subject, faithful to the Crown. The earliest anticipation of the Declaration of Independence came from the hand of Thomas Paine. It consisted of an article called "A Serious Thought" printed in the *Pennsylvania Journal* of October 18, 1775, in which Paine condemned the "horrid cruelties exercised by Britain" and prophesied the ultimate secession of the Colonies. This article was the forerunner of *Common Sense,* which Paine published anonymously on January 10, 1776. Half a million copies were soon in the hands of the people, and edition after edition poured from the press. Paine refused to accept a penny from the sale of this book, thus depriving himself of quite a considerable fortune. Six months later, the Declaration of Independence was drafted and signed. Many people are convinced that Paine himself wrote the Declaration, although the several drafts were in the handwriting of Thomas Jefferson. But, as William Cobbett said, "Whoever wrote the Declaration, Thomas Paine was its author."

The influence of those Adepts who sponsored the formation of the American Republic and guided the drafting of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution is seen in the fact that dogmatic religion plays no part in either of these documents. In the Declaration, *nature and nature's god* are specified, the *natural* rights of man (such as life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness) are defended, the King is described as the head of a *civilized* rather than

a "Christian" nation, and the appeal is made to the *native* justice and magnanimity of the British. In the Constitution of 1787 it is stated that no religious test shall be required as qualification for office, and the first Amendment to Art. VI prohibits the establishment of religion or the restraint of its free exercise. It is wrong, therefore, to describe the United States as a "Christian" country.

In *Common Sense* Paine outlined his plan for a representative government of the people, for the people and by the people, thus originating the form known as the modern democratic republic. In his *Rights of Man* he declared that "the government of America, which is wholly on the system of representation, is the only *real* Republic in character and in practice that now exists."

Believing that "those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it," Paine at once volunteered for service in the patriot army, and shortly afterward wrote the first of his thirteen pamphlets on the American Crisis. This pamphlet, beginning with the famous words "These are times which try men's souls," was read to every regiment by Washington's orders, and the courage it inspired in the soldiers resulted in their winning the Battle of Trenton.

In 1777 Paine was elected Secretary of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and two years later became Clerk of the Pennsylvania Assembly. At once an act for the abolition of slavery in Pennsylvania was introduced, which was adopted in the following year. In 1781 Paine went to France to obtain help for the Continental Congress. The King loaded him with favors, and sent him back with a quarter of a million livres in silver and a convoy ship laden with supplies. This timely help from France enabled the young nation to continue the campaign to victory.

After the war was over, Paine bought a little house in Bordentown, New Jersey, and turned his energies toward perfecting those inventions for which he afterward became famous. His most important invention was that of an iron bridge, the forerunner of our modern steel bridges. He also evolved the principle employed for the propulsion of the modern automobile and invented a smokeless candle which embodied the principle now known as the "central draught burner." Paine was also one of the inventors of the steamboat, and Sir Richard Phillips, who assisted Robert Fulton in his experiments on the Thames, openly declared that Thomas Paine had the idea of applying steam to navigation before Robert Fulton, although the latter received all the credit. As the Count de St.

Germain told his friend Franz Graeffer that he had to go to London in 1790, "to prepare two new inventions which you will have in the next century—trains and steamboats," it is highly probable that it was he who gave Paine his ideas on the subject. Paine was in England most of that year, having returned to Europe in 1787.

In the spring of 1790 Paine visited Paris. He found the French people still rejoicing over the fall of the Bastille. Lafayette assured him that its overthrow was due entirely to the transfer of American principles to France, and presented him with the key to the old fortress. On the first of May Paine returned to London and sent the key to General Washington. It now rests in Washington's old home at Mount Vernon.

In the autumn of 1790 Edmund Burke's book in defense of monarchy appeared. Paine replied by writing the first part of his *Rights of Man,* which he dedicated to Washington. Early in 1791 he returned to Paris, where he founded the first republican club in France and wrote his famous Republican Manifesto. He returned to London in July and wrote the second part of his *Rights of Man,* which he dedicated to Lafayette. Three months later he was summoned to appear before the Court of the King's Bench, and was denounced in the House of Commons for having "reviled what was most sacred in the Constitution, destroyed every principle of subordination, and established nothing in their room." William Blake advised him to leave England at once. Twenty minutes after his boat left Dover an order appeared for his arrest.

Paine's dearest hopes were now centered in the success of the French Revolution and the new Republic. He installed himself in the house at Number 63 Faubourg St. Denis, which had formerly been the home of Madame Pompadour, and where the Count de St. Germain had been a frequent visitor. There he gathered his little republican circle around him and discussed ways and means of helping the French people. In 1792 four different departments of France elected him a member of the French National Convention, and the National Assembly made him a citizen of the French Republic. A year later he began writing his last book, *The Age of Reason.* On the day the first volume was finished Paine was arrested as a foreigner and sent to the Luxembourg prison, where he languished for ten months. After his release he spent eighteen months with James Munroe, in whose home he finished the second part.

The *Age of Reason,* which probably has been more maligned and misrepresented than any other book of its kind, was written with

the desire of divesting religion of its superstitions. Although Paine was brought up as a Quaker, he confessed that from the time he was capable of conceiving an idea and acting upon it, he "either doubted the Christian system or felt it to be a strange affair." Paine's idea of religion was one which would bind *all* men together in one great brotherhood. In 1797 he founded in Paris an ethical society which promulgated a "religion of humanity" forty years before Auguste Comte used the phrase. It was called the society of Theophilanthropists, meaning, as he explained in a letter, "God, Love, and Man." He rendered the word, *Lovers of God and Man,* or *Adorers of God and Friends of Man.* Paine argued for the existence of God as a "Superior Cause," affirming that the eternal motion of matter is not an inherent property of matter, but must be derived from a superior source. The Theophilanthropists regarded Nature as the only reliable "book" on Theology. At their meetings they sang humanitarian hymns and read from the ethical teachings of the Bible and from Chinese, Hindu, and Greek authors. For a time the movement prospered, the members gathering in parish churches assigned to them by the Directory, but this privilege was withdrawn by Napoleon as a concession to Pius VII, and the Society lost its strength.

Paine knew that Christianity was not a new or unique religion, and declared that if Jesus had intended to found a new religion he would have written the system himself. He was willing to admit that Jesus might have been an actual character, although he had found no historical corroboration of the fact. When he compared the conflicting accounts of the genealogy of Jesus by Matthew and Luke, their discrepancies convinced him that this genealogy, instead of being a solemn truth, "is not even a reasonable lie." If these two Apostles started the history of Jesus with a palpable falsehood, "what authority is there for believing the strange things they tell us afterwards?" As for the four Gospels, he was convinced that they were not written by the persons to whom they are ascribed, as not even the names of their authors were known at the time the New Testament was assembled.

Thomas Paine was also a deep student of astronomy. When he considered the immensity of space and the vast number of worlds and solar systems encompassed therein, he failed to understand how "the Almighty, who had millions of worlds equally dependent upon His protection, should quit the care of all the rest, and come to die in our world because, they say, one man and one woman had eaten one apple." Although he was unable to accept the Jewish or

Christian concept of God, he still called himself a Deist. But the God he worshipped was the "First Cause eternally existing, of a nature totally different to any material existence we know of, and by the power of which all things exist." As Space is beginningless and endless, could God be less than Space? As Time is beginningless and endless, could God be less than Time? The Christian faith, in which God is presented as a *limited* Being, seemed to him to be a "species of Atheism—a sort of religious *denial* of God."

Thomas Paine believed that this Universe is governed by immutable Law. A miracle, therefore, was inconceivable. "Unless we know the whole extent of nature's laws," he argued, "we are not able to judge whether anything that may appear miraculous to us be within, or contrary to her natural power of acting." Hence the "miraculous birth" of Jesus appeared to him as an "obscene humbug," and he decried the sort of faith built upon such a premise.

Thomas Paine's own faith was centered in the belief of a First Cause eternally existing and of a Universe governed by Law, while his religion was summarized in his famous sentence: *My country is the world, and my religion is to do good.* As his religion transcended the formal professions of any cult or sect, he refused to accept the creed of any Church. "My mind is my church," he said, "and churches are but human inventions, set up to enslave mankind and monopolize power and profit."

The expression of such thoughts as these caused Thomas Paine to be called an infidel. Christian writers have claimed that he died a drunkard, that on his death-bed he confessed his error in attacking religious dogma, but these lies have long since been disproved. A splendid vindication of Paine as a temperate man to the day of his death, and as one who maintained his philosophic convictions to the last, is to be found in the works of Robert G. Ingersoll. Paine maintained that infidelity "does not consist in believing, or in disbelieving." It consists in professing to believe what one does not actually believe. Paine showed from history the record of the Christian Church and boldly asserted that "however unwilling the partisans of the Christian system may be to believe or acknowledge it, it is nevertheless true that the age of ignorance commenced with the Christian system. There was more knowledge in the world before that period than for many centuries afterward."

Thomas Paine returned to America in 1802, and for the next seven years he lived in poverty and isolation. The great and fearless soul of Thomas Paine went to its own place on June 8, 1809, the year that Abraham Lincoln was born.

The founding of the American Republic, which obviously formed part of the work of the Theosophical Movement, was an attempt to prepare a place where thought might be free from dogmatic religious prejudice and bigotry. From the moment of its conception, the United States has had a leading role in the great drama of human evolution. Washington and Paine were the creators of this Republic, Abraham Lincoln its preserver. Americans of the present and coming generation will be either its regenerators or its destroyers.

The "moment of choice" for this country will, from all indications, end in 1975. Between now and then the American people must decide whether their country will go forward or backward. In her Five Messages to the American Theosophists H. P. B. told us that our Karma as a nation had brought Theosophy *home* to us. In the Fourth Message, written just before her death, she gave us the method by which this country might be saved.

> Be Theosophists, work for Theosophy! Theosophy first and Theosophy last; for its practical realization alone can save the Western world from that selfish and unbrotherly feeling that now divides race from race, one nation from the other; and from that hatred of class and social considerations that are the curse and disgrace of so-called Christian peoples. Theosophy alone can save it from sinking entirely into that mere luxurious materialism in which it will decay and putrefy as civilizations have done. In your hands, brothers, is placed in trust the welfare of the coming century; and great as is the trust, so great also is the responsibility.

EDITOR'S NOTE: This article concludes the present cycle of studies in the Theosophical Movement which have been appearing in THEOSOPHY since the May, 1936, issue. "Great Theosophists," however, will be replaced by another and equally valuable series. Students will recall that some ten and more years ago a number of articles dealing with the mythology and religious and philosophical beliefs of the ancients were printed in THEOSOPHY (chiefly in volumes XIV, XV and XVI), under the general title of "Ancient Landmarks." The Greeks, however, received no treatment, and these ancestors of western civilization will therefore be the subject of a new group of "Ancient Landmarks" articles, beginning next month with "The Prehistoric Greeks."

HYPNOTISM AND THEOSOPHY

By WILLIAM Q. JUDGE, F. T. S.*

IS hypnotism understood? What is the attitude of the Theosophical Society to hypnotism?

It is thought by some that magnetism and hypnotism are identical; for many have said this new force or power is only the old practice of Mesmer revived in this century, after long years of contempt, and labeled with a new name, which will permit doctors to take it up. This is not, however, altogether true. Dr. Charcot, of Paris, and his followers, may be credited with the revival of hypnotism; for, in consequence of their investigations, it has been accepted by the medical profession. I have seen the prominent doctors of the Atlantic coast change their views on this subject in twenty-five years. Dr. Hammond and others laughed at the credulity of those who believed that the phenomena, now so well known among hynotizers, ever took place; today they write articles and admit the facts previously denied.

[Many years ago, Dr. Esdaile, a surgeon of the British army, conducted a hospital in India, and there performed many difficult operations by using magnetism as an anaesthetic, even instructing native assistants to use it on patients in his stead. His book, long ago published, gives all the facts. There is plenty of testimony in all countries to the reality of the mesmeric and hypnotic states and powers.]

The great question which arose after the proofs about hypnotism were in, was a very different one from any which has previously been brought forward. As soon as the process was described and admitted, experiments proceeded with rapidity, and the great subject of "suggestion" was laid bare. It was found that the hypnotized person could be made to do many strange things after recovering from the hypnotic state, provided the suggestion had been made to him when he was in the state. The subject was told to murder Dr. A or B; to steal a pocket-book. He was then taken out of the hypnotic state, and, at the appointed time, would take the suggested weapon—a paper knife or harmless thing—and go through all the required actions, or would actually steal the object he was told to steal. If this power could be used by a doctor in an experiment, it

*This article was printed in the *Jenness Miller Illustrated Monthly,* possibly some time in 1893. It is here reproduced from an undated page torn from this journal. A search for the volume in which it appeared has proved fruitless, the set in the Library of Congress being incomplete.—Editors.

was argued that an actual murder might be planned and executed through a hypnotized person. Hence it was dangerous. Crime is possible of perpetration with impunity by the real culprit. Dr. Charcot gave an article to an important New York magazine in which he admitted the probabilities of suggestion to patients, but denied that there was danger from suggested crime, and yet also said there ought to be laws against indiscriminate hypnotization. In the latter conclusion, most of the Theosophical Society's members fully concur, but they also think that there is, and will be, danger from crime suggested to hypnotic subjects. Not in the immediate present, but in the future.

This is because hypnotism is not understood nor its dangers appreciated by the medical profession; still less do they credit the public with a correct knowledge on the subject.

The very best hypnotizers know very well that there are points at which the hypnotized subject escapes their influence, continues in the hypnotic state, and remains under some influence not known to the operator nor distinguishable by the subject. Here is one danger—the danger of ignorance and of a blind guide's leading one equally blind. Such writers as Braid, Binet and others are only statisticians. They simply give facts and methods, all being equally in the dark as to causes and possibilities. Again, the operators in the forefront of hypnotic fame know, too, as Dr. Charcot has said, there is a danger that hysteria will be developed where it never existed, and a long train of other evils. This is why he demands the suppression of indiscriminate operating. But the real rock of offense is this, and well known to theosophical students, that as the force and power of hypnotism are better known, it will be seen that whatever the influence is, the process going on in hypnotism is the contracting of the cells of the body and brain from the periphery to the centre. This process is actually a phenomenon of the death state, and is the opposite of the mesmeric effect; and this point is not known to the medical profession, nor will it be as they now proceed, because *post mortem* examinations never reveal the action of a living cell. Magnetism by human influence starts from within and proceeds to the outer surface, thus exhibiting a phenomenon of life the very opposite of hypnotism. And the use of magnetism is not objectionable, yet it should be limited in practice to competent members of the medical profession. The more studious and careful members of the Theosophical Society, then, are against the use of hypnotism. In all its anaesthetic phases it can be duplicated by mesmerism without any bad effects. Dr. Esdaile has abundantly

shown this. Laws ought to be passed making it a misdemeanor to have a public or private hypnotic séance. And these laws should also be aimed at even those doctors who, under the plea of science, put subjects into absurd and undignified positions. Such practices are not necessary, and are deliberately against the desire of the waking will and judgment of the subject. They only exhibit the operator's power and add nothing to knowledge that cannot be otherwise obtained.

But even with the remarkable cases recorded by Binet and others in France, the laws governing man's inner constitution, and which especially govern in hypnotism after a certain point, are not perceived by the learned writers. Some give only facts—either facts about strange recurrence of states, and others like Dr. James of this country assume that there is a hidden self who does these queer tricks with the mortal shape. Theosophists know that the extraordinary alterations in mind or mental power, the strange "recurrence of states" and the apparently distinct division or separation of intelligence in a single human subject are all explained by the ancient eastern method of reducing the inner powers of man into seven classes, in each of which the hidden self—the *Ego*—can and does act independently, the body being only a gross instrument or field for the action of the real man.

This theory divides him into seven planes of action, in each of which the *Ego* or hidden self can have a consciousness operating in a manner peculiarly appropriate to that plane, and also partaking of the consciousness and experience of the planes above it but not below. And each of these layers or fields for consciousness is further divided into other sub-fields, in every one of which there may be a separate experience and action, or all may be combined. Now in the cases taken up by Dr. James, the peculiarity noted was that when the subject acted as No. 1, she had no recollection of a state called No. 2. No explanation of this was offered, only the fact being recorded. It is explained by the localization of the consciousness of the *Ego* in one or the other of the sub-fields of action of the first of the great class of seven.

The failure to recollect from one to the other was due to the fact that the *Ego* was forced into that particular field, and was thus unable to carry recollection with it. Hence it was entirely automatic in its action on that plane. This effect was due almost entirely to the specific contractile action of the hypnotic process, which, as said above, is essentially a contraction of the cells from outside to the centre. This will always prevent the *Ego* from educating itself to

remember from state to state and field to field the experience of each, which education is however possible in the mesmerized or magnetized state, and of course in the normal waking life.

The cases where the subject escapes from the operator's control are all explicable under the same theosophic theory; that is, those are instances in which the *Ego* retreats from the first plane or field of consciousness made up of seven divisions or sub-fields to the next one of the whole class of seven, instead of entering one of the sub-divisions of the first. And, as the medical practitioners do not know of nor admit the reality of the higher inner sub-divisions, they are not acquainted with the means for reaching the *Ego* when it has escaped further from them into a field of consciousness where they are in ignorance of causes and conditions; that is to say, the hypnotizers are not examining the *real* field of operation of the force, but are looking at some of its phenomena merely.

These phenomena are exhibited in the body or outer shell while the psycho-physiological process, going on within, and causing the visible phenomena, are hidden from their view.

The Only Reality

The spiritual Ego of man moves in eternity like a pendulum between the hours of birth and death. But if these hours, marking the periods of life terrestrial and life spiritual, are limited in their duration, and if the very number of such stages in Eternity between sleep and awakening, illusion and reality, has its beginning and its end, on the other hand, the spiritual pilgrim is eternal. Therefore are the hours of his *post-mortem* life, when, disembodied, he stands face to face with truth and not the mirages of his transitory earthly existences, during the period of that pilgrimage which we call "the cycle of re-births"—the only reality in our conception. Such intervals, their limitation notwithstanding, do not prevent the Ego, while ever perfecting itself, from following undeviatingly, though gradually and slowly, the path to its last transformation, when that Ego, having reached its goal, becomes a divine being. These intervals and stages help towards this final result instead of hindering it; and without such limited intervals the divine Ego could never reach its ultimate goal. —H. P. Blavatsky.

"CONTACT PROCESSES"

CATALYSIS and metabolism are familiar terms in chemistry and biology. They mean one thing to the experimenter in the laboratory, quite another to the professor and teacher in the schools, and still a third thing to the pupil in the class-room. To the layman they signify nothing definite, but merely "something in the dictionary," having no vital connection with everyday necessities and duties.

Although theosophists belong by heredity and environment within one or another of these four castes of mentality, they should, by virtue of their philosophy, be able to read at least a little of the larger word of life in the language of science and religion. This is to be done, in the first instance, by the negative process of separating the physical facts from the clouds of theory and revelation alike. Revelation and theory, we need to remind ourselves, are *meta*-physical. They stand in relation to sense-perceived categories as, say, gases, liquids and solids stand to each other—differing interpretations of different states of perceiver and things perceived.

Theosophy purports to be neither theory nor revelation, but an explanation of all the facts of manifested existence, whether objectively or subjectively perceived. That this is actually the case may be grasped intuitively, instinctively, or by ratiocination—according to the inner status of the student of life's mysteries and phenomena. Leading men in our day give little heed to the possibilities of intuition as a mode or method of exact knowledge. Their dependence is placed on reason. The great majority, devoid alike of intuition and of reason in any determinative sense, rely upon instinct and authority. Theosophy, if it is to benefit mankind, has to reach all these classes of minds with an appeal they can understand—in other words, has to speak to them in their own language. And that locution has to be employed by theosophists. They have to translate the great ideas of Theosophy into the strata of thought represented by such terms as science, religion, philosophy, psychology, and so on—all of them being in themselves purely metaphysical, since none of them can be found in "nature," but only in men's minds. Hence it is that H. P. Blavatsky in her first message to the American theosophists urged upon them that, for practical purposes of propagandum, they should bear in mind that Theosophy is to be presented to the world-at-large as "the philosophy of the rational explanation of things and not the tenets."

By one of her juxtapositions of words she preceded this phrase, "*rational* explanation," by saying that some "realize *intuitionally*" this "recognition of *pure* Theosophy," and follows by saying that this "is of the most vital importance *in the Society.*" In all too large part theosophists then and theosophists now have failed to grasp and apply her teachings, her modulus, her own example. *Isis Unveiled,* her first work, is an examination of Science and Theology, modern as well as ancient, on their own terms, in their own language, with the simple objective of ascertaining whether they do, or do not, supply a rational explanation of the common experiences of all men. Her own "tenets" are put forward in communal speech, for *comparative* purposes, *i.e.,* as a "rational explanation" of the mysteries which science and theology deal with only speculatively or in terms of authority—neither of which can ever satisfy the reason of all inquiring minds.

A decade after *Isis,* H. P. B. issued *The Secret Doctrine,* devoted to Cosmogenesis and Anthropogenesis, which is to say, to the problem of Origins. Just as *Isis* dealt primarily with the problems of things as they are, so *The Secret Doctrine* deals with the problem of beginnings—of how things have come to be as they are. And this as to "things" spiritual and metaphysical as well as physical. Even as *Isis* is devoted to a consideration of the currently accepted interpretations and is therefore "submitted to *public* judgment," so *The Secret Doctrine* "is written for the instruction of students of Occultism."

The distinction is enormous, and is accentuated by the difference in the dedication of the two Works. Thus, *Isis* is dedicated to the Theosophical Society, which was formed to study the subjects with which that work deals. The Parent Theosophical Society did not consist of "students of Occultism," but of men and women drawn from all the four quarters of the world of minds—all professedly in search of "the vital principles" underlying their several schools and creeds. But *The Secret Doctrine* is dedicated "To all true Theosophists, in every Country, and of every Race, for they called it forth, and for them it was recorded." In the ten intervening years a vast change must have occurred in the course of the Theosophical Movement—not merely in numbers, but catalytic and metabolic. Though the Work was "called forth" by those few who had "realized intuitionally" what pure Theosophy means, and had used their reason in the study of what she gave, by far the most part of those attracted had drifted away on one and another of the currents of old impulses quickened into activity by their contact—

victims of catalysis. Catalysis originally meant dissolution, degeneration, decay, in the sense of a breaking-down or loosening of old ties of cohesion or adhesion. A physical analogy is to be seen in the change from the solid to the liquid state.

Today, sixty years since *Isis* was published, there are millions and tens of millions of minds which have no more tenacity of purpose or idea than so much liquid. One has but to apply to them and to Theosophy the chemical definition of catalysis: "Acceleration of a reaction produced by the presence of a substance (called the *catalytic agent* or *catalyzer*) which itself remains unchanged."

Theosophy as a catalytic agent remains unchanged, but the minds which come into contact with it suffer various "reactions," all of which are "accelerated" indeed. Within a single generation, as anyone may note, swarms of parasitic movements, small and great, have sprung up from visionaries of one degree and another—lost to any "rational explanation of things."

But *The Secret Doctrine* was called forth by something else than the Will of the few intuitional theosophists. That Will is also, in its own degree, a "catalyzer." The opposite, or antithesis, or "reaction" of Will is Necessity — the old quandary which every "rational" mind has to confront. So, in the Preface to *The Secret Doctrine,* H. P. B. remarks that this work was "rendered necessary by the wild and fanciful speculations in which many Theosophists and students of mysticism have indulged, during the last few years, in their endeavor to, as they imagined, work out a complete system of thought from the few facts previously communicated to them."

So, she affirms, the book of that name "is not the Secret Doctrine in its entirety, but a select number of fragments of its *fundamental tenets,* special attention being paid to some facts which have been seized upon by various writers, and *distorted out of all resemblance to the truth.*"

If the first class of minds, those that drifted outside the Theosophical Movement, represent the catalytic results, those who remain within the sphere of the Movement but who have indulged in "wild and fanciful speculations" in their endeavours to "complete" the teachings given by H. P. B., — these may be fitly said to represent the psychological metabolism of "the students of Occultism." One has but to apply what is known of the processes of physiological metabolism to the like processes going on concurrently in mental and spiritual life, to understand the varieties and vagaries of the

distortions accepted by so many "Theosophists and students of mysticism" as "pure Theosophy."

The intuitional Theosophist, who observes the facts and uses his reason, will neither be disheartened nor sucked into any of these whirlpools of thought by the "contact processes" in the psychological "alimentary tract" of the exoteric Theosophical Movement. He will do as H. P. B. has done—give "special attention" to those facts, spiritual and metaphysical, which form the "fundamental tenets of the Secret Doctrine," so far as his own Theosophical education is concerned. And in his dealings with others he will talk to them neither in speculative nor authoritative terms, but in response to the common longing for "a rational explanation of things."

True Mysticism

To fully define Theosophy we must consider it under all its aspects. The interior world has not been hidden from all by impenetrable darkness. By that higher intuition acquired by Theosophia, or God-knowledge, which carried the mind from the world of form into that of formless spirit, man has been sometimes enabled in every age and every country to perceive things in the interior or invisible world. Hence the "Samâdhi," or Dhyân Yog Samâdhi, of the Hindû ascetics; the "Daimonion-photisma," or spiritual illumination of the Neo-Platonists; the "sidereal confabulation of soul," of the Rosicrucians or fire-philosophers; and, even the ecstatic trance of mystics and of the modern mesmerists and spiritualists, are identical in nature, though various as to manifestation. The search after man's diviner "self," so often and so erroneously interpreted as individual communion with a personal God, was the object of every mystic, and belief in its possibility seems to have been coëval with the genesis of humanity, each giving it another name.

—H. P. Blavatsky.

SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

The Origin of Man

I: *A Survey of Opinion*

IN any science, periodic tides of discovery, thought, and speculation seem to flow, now in this direction, now in that. In the field of anthropology, the demise of several once-powerful theories as to the nature and causes of evolution and a series of general impasses in collateral lines of science are events which seem to have signalized a slack tide; speculation appears to be marking time more or less until some new discovery starts the hue and cry in another direction. Meantime public opinion—and the pseudo-scientific opinion which is, unfortunately, the principal link between the public and real science—believes nearly as firmly in the theory of the "ape-ancestor" as ever, with logical consequences in general reversion to the mythical type, personally, socially, morally, politically, nationally and internationally.

Nevertheless, orthodoxy is being steadily undermined; even disregarding philosophical influence, another fifty years should see some startling changes, if only through the "boring from within" of some of the beneficent termites within the ranks of science itself, with whom we presently have to deal.

The death of Henry Fairfield Osborn removed from the ranks of science one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of modern evolutionists—a real scientist whose achievements, though less spectacular, may rank him with Charles Darwin. Although orthodox in his training and in his mental processes, Dr. Osborn was nevertheless a thinker both original and courageous. A theory to him meant little more than something to discard as soon as a more promising hypothesis appeared, and he was seldom guilty of the sort of scientific dogmatism which causes the unfortunate investigator to identify himself and his reputation with some special hypothesis. The fact, however, that he was as dyed-in-the-wool an orthogeneticist as any — thoroughly convinced that man and ape had common ancestry[1] — renders his criticisms of prevailing thories all the more valuable.

In 1932 Dr. Osborn examined the defects in four historic explanations of evolution (the theories of Lamarck, Darwin, Buffon and St. Hilaire, and the Entelechy of the Vitalists), together with

[1] In 1927 Dr. Osborn wrote: "I am inclined to advocate an independent line of Dawn Man ancestors, springing from an Oligocene neutral stock, which also gave rise independently to the anthropoid apes." (*Science*, May 20, 1927.)

their modern substitutes.[2] He closed this comprehensive criticism with the remark that the origin of bio-chemical adaptations was still entirely unsolved. He also presented, not for the first time, his own theory of Aristogenesis.

Succinctly, this theory proposes that the germ plasm itself contains an inherent tendency toward inevitable and predetermined evolution, always toward improvement, unmodified by the element of chance, or trial and error. Dr. Osborn was honest enough and modest enough not to put aristogenesis forward as an "explanation," but regarded it as rather a description. He urged that the mysterious and inexplicable nature of the process in no way invalidates the fact that new characters arise from the germ plasm. Biology, he remarked, is at present a totally unco-ordinated science, "still in its infancy."

The year 1934, which saw the last or nearly the last of his views published, found them substantially unchanged.[3]

> Biology at present can not be ranked with physics or chemistry as a branch of science. We await the arrival of a master mind which can synthesize the generalizations and inductions now being made in widely separate fields of research. The facts are multiplying at an enormous rate and from these facts hasty inductions are being made which are more or less biased by preconceptions in the mind of the observer, also by the special field of research in which the observations have been made. Among the host of facts which are wholly uninterpretable at present it is only natural for us to seek for interpretation or to try to fit the facts into the more or less senescent hypotheses as to the nature and causes of evolution. Despite Huxley's warning that science commits suicide when it adopts a creed we find many observers still strongly influenced by ancient scientific creeds. To my knowledge the most ancient is the "chance" hypothesis which dates back to Empedocles of Agrigentum and is still entertained by such modernists as T. H. Morgan and J. B. S. Haldane.

Dr. Osborn proceeds to show the great difference between the *selection of the fittest combinations of energy in an organism,* and the *origin* of specific organs. In his view, the Lamarckian theory is moribund. Closer to the truth, he thinks, is the creed of the direct action of the environment upon both organism and geneplasm. (But aside from a few stray and unsatisfactory indications of the destructive effect of radioactivity and the like upon the plasm, no

[2] *Science,* Dec. 2, 1932.
[3] *Science,* April 27, 1934.

shadow of a mechanism for such action has yet been discovered.) The theory of an internal perfecting principle of "entelechy," which Dr. Osborn regards as a distortion of Aristotle's "very sound inductions of an internal principle governing evolution," "does not bear the crucial test of observation." (What observation? On the contrary, the enormous mass of observations summed up in Dr. Seba Eldridge's *Organization of Life,* and the vitalistic deductions therein, are so conclusive that no one has even tried to contest them. The theory of "entelechies" is, of course, extremely *uncongenial* to those who insist upon a gross material cause for every event. Such a requirement, however, ignores the fact that matter has now slipped entirely through the fingers of the physicist and chemist. The theory of entelechy offers a degree of explanation for the observed facts; mechanism does not.)

Actually, it is difficult to see any real distinction between aristogenesis, Lamarckism, and entelechy. Each of these theories presupposes an inherent perfecting principle, which, in turn, implies inherent wisdom plus inherent energy. It may be supposed that Dr. Osborn's objection to Lamarckism and entelechy is that while his conception allows only for a *purely material* "perfecting principle" —intrinsic in the germ plasm—the other theories are more or less "vitalistic." Dr. Osborn ought to have consulted the physicists and chemists as to where the line between "material" and "immaterial" should be drawn! Every scientific student of Theosophy knows the synthesis of "entelechy" and "aristogenesis" therein contained, although the demarcation is rather an *area* than a line! Moreover, "aristogenesis" suggests that "perfectibility" is inevitable, while the reverse is the fact. Nature abounds with acquired characteristics which in many cases are meaningless from the point of view of material evolution, and in some cases actually adverse to survival—to say nothing of "overdone" adaptations which may become serious handicaps, even fatal ones. But theosophists approve most heartily Dr. Osborn's closing sentence, the parting advice of a veteran evolutionist to the scientific world:

> . . . let us quietly drop all these senescent hypotheses as to the nature and causes of evolution and make a wholly fresh start along entirely new and original lines of observation and experiment, directed toward the discovery of the now wholly unknown factors in this most mysterious of natural phenomena.

To this we have but one qualification to suggest: Why drop them "quietly"? In view of the misapprehensions abroad as to the nature and origin of man, and the social evils thereby engendered, we are

in favor of having the fall of these theories make as big a noise as possible.

W. L. McAtee, of the U. S. Biological Survey, mercilessly exposes the *mores* of the selectionist school of evolutionary theory:

> Attempts to draw hard-and-fast lines where none exist, to trammel within the limits of hypothesis where all is free, and to formulize where everything is protean, characterize the writings of selectionists. "Humility" does not put forward strained "explanations" for every detail of organic appearance and behavior, and in all truth "humility" can scarcely be claimed as a leading trait of definers, explainers and asserters of "natural laws." So it seems to the writer and so it has seemed also to others.
>
> It has been pointed out over and over again that the explanations of science never amount to more than the enumeration of the conditions under which the events in nature take place. With ultimate explanation, science does not deal.
>
> It should not be forgotten that all evolutionary phenomena are fundamentally inexplicable.
>
> From the peculiar nature of the case no causal explanation of evolution is possible.[4]

He particularly condemns overemphasis on the "struggle for existence," pointing out that the "struggle" has no selectionist significance where the intensity of the struggle is negligible, giving specific instances of such cases. The claim that "mimicry" is an evidence of adaptive selection receives like treatment:

> In this typical case of explanation of ant resemblance, we have not only overemphasis on the struggle for existence but also the usual attempt to draw lines where none occur in nature. Theorists point out that certain ant mimics by virtue of some assumed advantage live among ants, but they ignore the more numerous insect and other guests of ants that do not resemble their hosts. Ant-resembling creatures do not all live with ants, some of them (*Gelis spp.*) occurring in far northern regions where there are no ants. Some ant mimics may be predators upon ants but others (various Cerambycid and Anthicid beetles) neither prey upon nor live with the ants. The assumed advantage of ant resemblance in protecting its possessors from predators is a very tenuous one, as ants admittedly are freely eaten by a great variety of enemies. The "protection" really amounts to the swarms of ants taking the brunt of predation from the much less numerous "mimics," and this is merely a

[4] *Science,* April 20, 1934.

> consequence of their relative numbers, an advantage the rarer forms have anyway, regardless of their appearance.
>
> If ant mimicry is not necessary to existence among ants, if it occurs without any possible relation to ants, and if it can act as a protection only as a result of numerical ratios, it would seem not only unnecessary but erroneous to invoke a theory of mimicry through natural selection to account for it.

Prof. A. Franklin Shull, of the University of Michigan, observes almost disgustedly that, had there been no direct study or speculation on evolution from the publication of *The Origin of the Species* until 1910 or 1920, the present views would be sounder.[5] In other words, a principal task ahead is to clear away the mists of unwarranted speculation which have been so largely the "achievement" of evolutionist science since Darwin. Dr. Shull also disputes the "mimicry" theory, remarking that the colors left unexplained are no more marvelous than the theories which attempt to explain them; that an account of the evolution of the human imagination would lead to more light on these theories than we have now. Continuing in terms which, if used by anyone but a scientist would be regarded as quite rude, Dr. Shull stigmatizes the period of our predecessors in evolutionary theory as one of "bewildering obfuscations, scientific hallucinations, abbreviated in this day of governmental alphabetics to BOSH." He is certain "that even a moderately full knowledge" of the factors of evolution is "still far beyond."

Dr. Cockerell, of the University of Colorado, reviewing books by Shull, and by Robson and Richards, takes much the same view.[6] The efficacy of "natural selection" is severely discounted. There is "little positive evidence in its favor, so much that appears to tell against it, and so much that is yet inconclusive, that we have no right to assign to it the main causative role in evolution." "Mimicry" as a factor in adaptation is more or less discredited, but Dr. Cockerell also suggests that the pheonomenon of imitation cannot be purely accidental. "There are," he says, "cases that suggest some unknown magic, some mysterious influences at present undiscovered." An instance is the ant parasite which mimics on a small scale the ant on which it lives.

Is it possible, one wonders, that all evolution proceeds by some kind of "mimicry"—whether "unconscious," as in the tendency of the mineral to respond to embodiment in higher forms, "subconscious," as in the copying by the animal of prototypal characteristics locked

---

[5] *Science*, May 10, 1935.

[6] *Science*, Aug. 28, 1936.

up in the human form; or *conscious,* as in the aspiration of man to higher states, which, though man has forgotten it, are the *existing* states of many of his predecessors? Mimicry is not only an expression of the natural striving of lower forms of life toward a higher condition; it is also evident in the imitation of one form by another on the same plane of evolution, or even, as in the case of man himself when actuated by a perverted desire nature, of the imitation of a lower form of life by a higher one—the degradation of spiritual powers.

H. P. B. on "Natural Selection"

As to Natural Selection itself, the utmost misconception prevails among many present-day thinkers who tacitly accept the conclusions of Darwinism. It is, for instance, a mere device of rhetoric to credit "Natural Selection" with the power of *originating* species. "Natural Selection" is no Entity; but a convenient phrase for describing the mode in which the survival of the fit and the elimination of the unfit among organisms is brought about in the struggle for existence. Every group of organisms tends to multiply beyond the means of subsistence; the constant battle for life—the "struggle to obtain enough to eat and to escape being eaten" added to the environmental conditions—necessitating a perpetual weeding out of the unfit. The *élite* of any stock thus sorted out, propagate the species and transmit their organic characteristics to their descendants. All useful variations are thus perpetuated, and a progressive improvement is effected. But Natural Selection, in the writer's humble opinion, "Selection, *as a Power,*" is in reality a pure myth; especially when resorted to as an explanation of the origin of species. It is merely a representative term expressive of the manner in which "useful variations" are stereotyped when produced. Of itself, "it" *can produce nothing,* and only operates on the rough material presented to "it." The real question at issue is: what Cause—combined with other secondary causes—produces the "variations" in the organisms themselves. Many of these secondary causes are purely physical, climatic, dietary, etc., etc. Very well. But beyond the secondary aspects of organic evolution, a deeper principle has to be sought for. The materialist's "spontaneous variation," and "*accidental* divergencies" are self-contradictory terms in a universe of "Matter, Force and Necessity." Mere variability of type, apart from the supervisory presence of a quasi-intelligent impulse, is powerless to account for the stupendous complexities and marvels of the human body for instance. —*The Secret Doctrine.*

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

WHEN *we think of objects we create pictures in the mind —images. When we dwell on fundamental truths, on abstract ideas, what form does the thought take?*

(*a*) Ideas which are abstract for us here in bodies are objectively apparent to the Ego, the real man. In deep sleep the Ego is free from the modifications of the senses and perceives fundamental truths. When in waking life we dwell on abstract eternal ideas, we draw closer to the unclouded perception of the soul. In deep sleep the Ego speaks in his own language. This speech cannot be taught as languages in the world today are taught. Each one must learn it for himself. The Great Teachers have shown us all that is necessary in order to begin. As incarnations of Divinity in physical waking life, They instruct humanity through the language of the soul, by symbol, allegory, and parable.

The speech of the Ego is beyond our ordinary sounds and phrases of speech; it is based upon the occult symbols of sound, color and number. On this subject Mr. Crosbie wrote:

> It is related to geometrical forms—the circle, the triangle, the square, the various angles and counterangles, all of which have their meaning. The four-pointed star, the five-pointed star, the six- and seven-pointed stars, for instance, all have their distinctive meanings. Perhaps the five-pointed star with some would refer to man and be a means of identifying man, just as words serve in waking consciousness as a means of identification. The four-pointed star would refer to an animal, and so on. The soul's language is all allegorical, in fact. (*Answers to Questions on The Ocean of Theosophy,* p. 221.)

It is not so much the images used as the quality and motive behind thought that distinguish concrete from abstract ideas. The Soul might take for its purpose a grain of sand as symbol for a mountain, or a drop of water for a lake.

For the Ego there is no past, present, or future. Just as a chemist uses symbols to signify elements and compounds, so the Ego has symbols for lessons and experiences of life. The pictures of symbolic language give bird's-eye views of great stretches of time and space in a flash. In this way an allegory presents the vision of the timeless Ego.

(*b*) There can be no thought unless there is something to think about. The power to make an image in some form of substance is the basis of thought. The thinker could not see an object or idea unless the mind had already formed a picture in some kind of matter. The human mind, being limited to manifestation, is therefore finite and cannot comprehend or form pictures of the infinite. While naturally clear and uncolored, mind is modified by every object and subject that comes before it—chameleon-like, it is tinted by whatever objects it is directed to, sponge-like it absorbs that to which it is applied; and sieve-like it at once loses its former color and shape the moment another object is taken up. How then could the mind form "images" of basic fundamentals or pure abstraction, of such symbols as abstract space or motion, or even of the abstract power to think, feel or act? The meaning of such truths we feel rather than visualize. For their realization a higher power than mind is necessary, but no particular power can ever fully encompass the Source of all power.

As mind is the *tool* of the Thinker, it cannot make an image or picture of that which does the thinking. To attempt to do so is to anthropomorphize It. Man's endeavor to describe, limit, or make an "image" of the Unknowable was the origin of the personal god idea. According to H. P. B., "man anthropomorphized pure abstraction from the beginning of his speculation." Speaking of the state of Absoluteness, she wrote:

> Nor can it be symbolized except in negatives; for, since it is the state of Absoluteness *per se,* it can possess none of those specific attributes which serve us to describe objects in positive terms. Hence that state can only be suggested by the negatives of all those most abstract attributes which men feel rather than conceive, as the remotest limits attainable by their power of conception. (*S. D.* I, 21.)

But perhaps the questioner refers to thoughts which pertain to higher planes than the physical, but still deal with the manifested world. We have only to look around us to find evidences of the pictures formed by thinking. The whole universe is a result of the image-making power of Mind. It is said that during Pralaya, the night time of the Universe, the Universal Spirit remained in a state of quiet with no objects, because as yet there was no modification. But resolving to create or emanate the universe, IT formed a *picture* of what should be, and this at once was a modification. Thereupon the Divine Idea was expanded and gradually brought forth into objectivity, becoming visible and invisible nature. The forms and

laws of sun and planet are the most remote emanative effect of Divine Thought. Matter itself is crystallized light, or thought. (See *S. D.* I, 44-45, 328-30.)

If the mind of the race is to be changed by Theosophy, why not work at changing the leaders, the educators and editors? How can Theosophists hope to bring about a change without converting those who influence the race mind?

(*a*) The following quotation from *Gregg Typewriting Speed Studies,* by A. B. Hakes, gives what constitutes the current idea of the good leader of the people:

> The greatest man is the man who comes nearest to executing the will of the people. He is "servant of all." If he is a poet, he utters the word they dumbly feel. If he is an artist, he bodies forth their impotent fancy. If he is a statesman, he materializes their political convictions. If he is an orator or a writer, he says what they all would say. Always behind him is the mass, from which he draws his force.

Catering to public desire, pleasing the people, expressing their impotent fancies, saying what they dumbly feel—is this true leadership? Do not the mass mind, the mass emotions, the mass desires in reality become the leader in such case? The so-called "leader" of today has influence, but it is largely *psychic* influence, and he is himself only one of the mass whose voice is for the time louder, whose intellect is keener, or whose ambition is stronger than that of his fellow-men. Suppose he could be "converted," since his influence is psychic it would be of little value in the promulgation of a philosophy which is "the *rational* explanation of things." People who become theosophists first—children and young people who receive a Theosophical education—these will some day take their places in the world as editors, educators, scientists, and, setting forth the Truth, will be the guides for those who are ready. They will never seek to convert or to use emotional methods of persuasion.

Truth is very powerful and needs only a hearing. The men who today have power can exercise their influence because they represent the karma of the people. Leaders can do little until that karma is changed by right thinking and acting.

When anyone contacts and "sees" Theosophy, it is by no means a casual occurrence. The conditions which bring one to recognize the truth come about under the law of karma, which applies to all men in all positions. The third fundamental proposition of Theosophy says that progress and evolution in the human kingdom proceeds through self-induced and self-devised efforts. Accordingly,

theosophists know that there is only one person who can convert a man, and that is himself. The best the theosophist can do is to disseminate the teachings through precept and example, without appealing to any special persons or class of people.

(*b*) To the man and women of this generation not familiar with the history of the present Theosophical Movement, Theosophy and Theosophical ideas seem to have made very little impression on the minds of people. But when one examines present-day views on deity, nature and man, in contrast with the accepted ideas of half a century ago and with the aims and teachings of the Messengers of Theosophy, he cannot fail to observe the profound and far-reaching, if uncredited and unrecognized, influence They have exercised in every department of human interest.

In the field of religion many serious writers have been helped by, or have helped themselves to, the teachings of Theosophy. That their output has had an immense effect on the popular mind is undeniable. A similar leavening process has been and is taking place in the world of scientific thought.

The writings of innumerable thoughtful men and women reveal ideas unmistakably derived and adopted from the teachings brought by H. P. Blavatsky. Contrast the immense output of books, periodicals, magazines and newspaper articles of the present day, which are colored by Theosophical ideas, with the scarcity of such literature prior to 1875, and the extent to which the Theosophical Movement has affected and influenced the mind of the race becomes evident. Although many leaders, educators and editors have been directly or indirectly influenced by Theosophical ideas, Theosophy pure and simple has still a severe battle to fight for recognition. People the world over are more than ever questioning the foundations on which our civilization is built. With every year the questions become louder and more insistent, and require the positive answer which Theosophy affords. Modern religion, science and philosophy do not and cannot give a satisfactory reply to these queries. It will not be very long before the people realize that their leaders, educators and editors are unprepared and unable to supply an adequate solution to modern problems. When the awakening of the masses is complete, where will they turn, with what will they replace their fallen "gods" and idols?

The teachings of Theosophy were presented to the world by the Messengers in anticipation of just such a condition. The Teachers foresaw the problems and needs of this age of transition and inquiry. They therefore recorded through H. P. B. the sublime

teachings of Theosophy—the philosophy of the rational explanation of things—inasmuch as it alone can furnish the beacon-light needed to guide humanity on its true path. Not only did They provide the philosophy of Theosophy, but They also illustrated the methods and principles by means of which it could be brought home to the people. Today true Theosophists the world over are engaged in forming and perpetuating centers where Theosophy pure and simple may be studied and promulgated. Based on the lines laid down by the Teachers, active Theosophical work is proceeding vigorously. Lectures, study classes and Theosophy School for children are held regularly throughout the year. In these centers people acquire a true and thorough Theosophical education, and from them are going into the various fields of modern life a growing number of young men and women equipped with an understanding of the aims and objects of the Theosophical Movement.

Theosophy will ultimately change and raise the race mind. Through the medium of lectures, study classes and Theosophy School a growing number of people are constantly being made aware of the existence of Divine Ideas and a Divine purpose in life. Growing men and women who have assimilated Theosophical teachings are gradually finding a place in the political, educational and scientific fields and are applying Theosophical principles to the many perplexing questions that arise. Theosophists hope to change the race mind, not by converting the present day leaders to Theosophy, but by themselves providing the leaders, educators, scientists, and editors of the future and by continuing to support the United Lodge of Theosophists so that the Message in its entirety may be made available to the world.

(*c*) If the mind of the race is to be changed by Theosophy, the younger generation will be the instrument of that change, people who are educated primarily to think for themselves and to love all men. These boys and girls will be among the leaders of the future, the educators and editors who will permeate and influence the race mind. Children trained on this basis will grow to understand the wisdom of the East as well as that of our own Greek heritage, and they will rescue the real history of mankind, present history being for the most part "a series of lies," according to Carlyle.

The almost insuperable difficulty of converting the present leaders of society is obvious; they lack the desire and the will to reform themselves. Anyone can see in himself how difficult it is to overthrow a life training in religious dogma, in prejudices of all

kinds—national, racial, and caste. Before theosophical ideas can take root in a man, he must first take stock of himself and see his prejudices and preconceptions for what they are—barriers in the path of knowledge. Then it is for him to get rid of them, and every vestige of selfishness. This means that the trinity of thought, will, and feeling must be turned in another direction. It takes a noble desire to do this, and a strong will.

How We "Remember"

Our "memory" is but a general agent, and its "tablets," with their indelible impressions, but a figure of speech: the "brain-tablets" serve only as a *upadhi* or a *vahan* (basis, or vehicle) for reflecting at a given moment the memory of one or another thing. The records of past events, of every minutest action, and of passing thoughts, in fact, are really impressed on the imperishable waves of the Astral Light, *around us* and everywhere, not in the brain alone; and these mental pictures, images, and sounds, pass from these waves *via* the *consciousness of the personal Ego* or Mind (the lower Manas) whose grosser essence is astral, into the *"cerebral reflectors,"* so to say, of our brain, whence they are delivered by the psychic to the *sensuous* consciousness. This at every moment of the day, and even during sleep. . . .

Man, in addition to the physical, has also a spiritual brain. If the former is wholly dependent for the degree of its receptivity on its own physical structure and development, it is, on the other hand, entirely subordinate to the latter, inasmuch as it is the spiritual Ego alone, and accordingly as it leans more toward its two highest principles, or towards its physical shell, that can impress more or less vividly the outer brain with the perception of things purely spiritual or immaterial. Hence it depends on the acuteness of the mental feelings of the inner Ego, on the degree of spirituality of its faculties, to transfer the impression of the scenes its semi-spiritual brain perceives, the words it hears and what it feels, to the sleeping physical brain of the outer man. The stronger the spirituality of the faculties of the latter, the easier it will be for the Ego to awake the sleeping hemispheres, arouse into activity the sensory ganglia and the cerebellum, and to impress the former—always in full inactivity and rest during the deep sleep of man with the vivid picture of the subject so transferred. —H. P. Blavatsky.

THE KINGDOMS OF NATURE

PSYCHOLOGY means in a practical sense the conscious cultivation of the various powers, faculties and functions innate or acquired. When this is undertaken, the student soon finds out his own strong and weak points, soon learns much that is as useful as it is unpalatable from the personal basis which has hitherto determined his conduct. He has, so to say, to begin all over. In what way?

Perhaps first of all is the necessity for redefining his own familiar terms for self, for subjective and objective experiences. He may choose any unexplored area of experience for this experiment, and the immediate lesson is that no experience stands alone and unrelated, that no being exists in isolation. In the same way no power exists by itself, no exercise of body, senses, mind or understanding but involves other parts of the nature, finally the whole nature of the being. Thus the lesson of relativity will lead directly to the lesson of unity. Self-examination and ordinary observation will disclose that the accustomed conduct of the business of life issues from the notion of separateness. Not only is this the common fact, but it is so universally prevalent that ordinarily it escapes all but incidental or casual notice.

Applying these lessons to the kingdoms in nature as they are dealt with by leaders and followers alike in the various relations of human existence and action, it becomes evident that the word Nature is an inclusive, not an exclusive expression, is both general and particular. Gods, men, animals and whatever other beings there may be, all form parts of nature. Good and evil, happiness and sorrow, birth and death, wisdom and folly, have no existence apart from nature, from being and action. The futile attempt of so many minds to separate them fills the annals of race history and racial evolution.

When, then, one considers the kingdoms of nature, their interdependence is unmistakably apparent. No more than the individual can the kingdom of which he is a unit-member be isolated from the other sovereignties. Each kingdom, therefore, represents, collectively as in its component units, an outlook from a given center, a sphere of action with a given radius. To speak, then, of "free-will" or of "fate," as though either were a finality, is to ignore the plainest of life's lessons. There is free-will for every form of life—

within limits. There is fate or destiny for each being, great or small—within limits. The grand question arises spontaneously, What are those limits and whence do they derive? They spring from Self, they spring from action, they spring from the interrelations of each self with other selves and with the whole.

This brings one to the consideration of Intelligence, manifested or unmanifested, latent or active. It is here that what Mr. Judge calls "the mathematics of the soul" comes into play, for wherever there is a problem of any kind, there must mathematics be employed in its solution. What we are accustomed to call philosophy, science, religion, psychology, and so on, are but so many efforts to devise and apply a system of mathematics to the problems of life. Each man is able to inquire of self where the system he relies upon is efficient and where it is defective. All must have some merit, or they would solve no problems at all, not even the least.

Mathematics is only another word to indicate the fundamental assumption of the reign of law in every thing and in every circumstance and relation—qualitative as well as quantitative, in metaphysics as in physics. If words are to be given any valid significance, then many of the terms familiarly employed really represent only human ignorance, human failure to study and apply psychology. There is no mathematics, no recognition of the rule of law, in such words, for example, as chance, luck, accident, miracle. They all imply the denial of order, of sequence, of correlation. They all ignore the principle of progression, they all violate the simplest conception of equity and justice. What all such expressions do demonstrate is that they confine what we do not see to terms of what we do perceive. In whatever direction one chooses to look, with his senses or his mind, or both, he will see objects and subjects which seem to be unrelated, and separate. What does this mean in terms of law? Merely that he does not see the connection. Is not this the case with every problem, big or little? If we saw the connection, there would be no problem; the known and the unknown would be seen to be one.

Between force and matter there is obviously a difference and a relation. The one could not exist without the other. Have we solved the nature of either, or of their interactions and reactions? As plainly, there is a relation and a distinction between mind and matter. Do we know what either is, or of what further phenomena they are capable? None would deny the interdependence of the kingdoms of nature, animate and inanimate, but has any one of our scholiasts or experimenters succeeded in doing more than ascertain

a few of their combinations? This is as if a child who had memorized a few numbers imagined it had the key to notation and numeration.

Between the mineral and vegetable kingdoms there exists a gap, as between the vegetable and the animal, the animal and the human. Does our science, any more than our religion, bridge those gaps? Has anyone we know of bridged the gap between normal and abnormal, between sanity and insanity, waking, dreaming, and sleep, between birth and death? In these and many other problems all alike have to admit or confess that the sum-totals of human experience and experimentation are devoid of a mathematics, an understanding of law, of self, of the facts, that can in any sense be called knowledge.

It is possible, from our point of view, to reach the negative conclusion of so many, that the real problems of existence are insoluble —that we must at last repose on faith or scepticism. When this outlook is examined it implies in the one case that though these problems are insoluble by us they have been solved by others upon whose authority we may safely rely. The other view implies that, ignorant and limited though we are, we are yet able to determine the possible from the impossible. In both cases there is the same denial of progress, of any law of progression. Do the facts, even as we are aware of them, warrant either the assumptions or the conclusions of our schools and systems?

What actual warrant is there for the assumption that man or any other being was ever "created"? That man is, or ever was, an "animal"? On the contrary, does not all that is known show clearly that man is derived from *all* the kingdoms of nature known to us in any degree, and from other sources beyond our range of present perception and conduct? Is not the same true of everything else known to us in any sense?

All that we know, all that we experience, all that we contact, tells us unmistakably, would we but think, that neither we nor any of the kingdoms, nor all of them, are at either the top or the bottom of the "ladder of life and being." All alike are learners in one school, and the several "kingdoms" merely represent grades in that school. These pupils are, one and all, "the same in kind, differing only in degree."

JOHN BUNYAN—REFORMER

THE natural tendency of the human mind to seek for unity—even on the plane of separateness, where no unity exists—is often the cause of the difficulties experienced by one who would trace the lines of the Theosophical Movement in western history. Contrast, for example, the lives and works of Luther and Erasmus, of Spinoza and Voltaire, of Paine and Saint-Martin: how different in temper, in what were apparently their immediate purposes; yet each of these men made great contributions to the cause which, in Mr. Judge's words, is to be found "Wherever thought has struggled to be free, wherever spiritual ideas, as opposed to forms and dogmatism, have been promulgated." The one great Will, which "keeps this whole Movement in being," must undergo bifurcations of expression when manifesting through the diverse and conflicting currents of European civilization. A particularly interesting phase of this problem lies in a study of the seventeenth century, the latter half of which saw philosophic and scientific developments of great importance to subsequent generations. In that period Spinoza quietly set down and published ideas which were literally revolutionary to the then accepted theological view of deity and man. Not less significant was the monadology of the German philosopher and mathematician, Leibniz. In England, Isaac Newton was formulating the laws of motion which were to become the foundation of modern physical science, while his contemporaries, the Cambridge Platonists, strove to leaven the religious thought of the time with Platonic philosophy and to lessen the bewilderments of Christian scripture by applying keys of Kabalistic interpretation.

The chaotic middle years of the seventeenth century in England began a cycle of religious changes, in some cases for the better. A number of "Messengers of God" appeared, rousing the fanatical revolt which led to the execution of Charles I in 1649. This deed was defended by Milton, the poet-laureate of Protestant theology, who gave Hellenic grandeur to the Jewish Jehovah. No great writer more unfortunately lent his genius to the materialization of religious ideas. The years from 1648 to 1666 witnessed the successful founding in both England and America of the Society of Friends. The Quakers, as is generally known, are distinguished from other Christian sects by their doctrine of the "Light of Christ in Man," their rejection of ritualistic forms and the *practice* of the virtues which Christianity entails.

Remembering that the cycle of spiritualism in the last century began in 1848, with the "Rochester rappings," it is significant that George Fox, the founder of the Quaker movement, began to preach at about 1647, in the conviction that he was a chosen instrument of Providence. On an occasion of great doubt and despair a voice within him said: "There is a living God who made all things." He felt that he was called to awaken men from their lifeless dogmas to an inward, spiritual religion. The historian, Bancroft, wrote of the rise of the Society of Friends as "the consequence of the moral warfare against corruption, — the aspiration of the human mind after a perfect emancipation from the long reign of bigotry and superstition." Fox was several times imprisoned for alleged "blasphemy" and because of his scruples against taking oath.

Another religious reformer of the same period was John Bunyan, whose brave career reflects the turbulent fortunes of the English monarchy on the one hand, and the inner vicissitudes of a tortured but finally triumphant Christian conscience on the other. His famous work, *Pilgrim's Progress,* still has a sale of more than 20,000 copies a year, in the United States alone. The anniversary of Bunyan's death, 250 years ago, is made the occasion of an appreciative article in the New York Times *Magazine* of Sept. 4. He married in 1649, at the age of twenty-one, and while he and his bride had "not so much as a dish or a spoon betwixt them," the girl brought him the Puritan faith. In the words of the *Times* writer,

> . . . she handed him two books—"The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven" and "The Practice of Piety"—and Bunyan took to serious reading.
>
> Suddenly he was plunged into an agony of soul that almost cost him his reason. He prayed to trees, to a broomstick, to the parish bull. He tried to work miracles, ordering the puddles in the road to dry up and staking his salvation on the result. However it is to be explained, whether in terms of psychology or mysticism, Bunyan emerged from these dark broodings into the light of day.

Bunyan is accounted to have been "insane," in the medical sense of the word, from about 1650 to 1653, and his book, *Grace Abounding,* as Dr. Hyslop remarks in *The Great Abnormals,* "contains particulars sufficient to fill up the certificate and case-book of the mental specialist." Much of his life was spent in prison for preaching, and except for the interludes of the Commonwealth and that provided by the Declaration of Indulgence from 1672 to 1675, he was the object of almost continuous persecution. In the latter

year, when the Declaration was cancelled, Bunyan's license as a Nonconformist preacher was recalled and a warrant signed by no less than thirteen magistrates issued for his arrest! He would not keep silent, and in "the den" of the jail in Bedford, where tradition says he was imprisoned, John Bunyan unfolded the tale of the moral struggles of Christian—or rather, of Bunyan himself.

> Out of his own inner turmoil and in the majestic yet musical style of the King James version of the Bible, which he had absorbed from cover to cover, he told his story . . . — the story of a man who challenged his environment and dared to call his soul his own. In temporal matters this man obeyed the law. But the spirit within him was surrendered to a higher authority than the state.
>
> Whatever view be taken of Bunyan's evangelism, he is himself a man of our own time—a dauntless champion of those rights of the individual without which no life can be lived which is worth living. Multitudes are suffering the oppression that he endured, and essentially for the same reason. His especial glory was that, with a contemptuous world of power and fashion against him, he dared to write of his defeat as a victory.

How did Bunyan achieve such a masterpiece as *Pilgrim's Progress*? asks the *Times* writer. There is, he thinks, "no adequate answer."

> All we can say is that the allegory unfolds an autobiography. The book explains the man and the man explains the book.

Does it? In her article, "Is Theosophy a Religion?" H. P. B. makes some extremely definitive statements bearing directly on all such cases of religious inspiration—the precise applications of which, however, each one must make for himself:

> Theosophy—owing, in truth, to the *levée in arms* of all the Spiritualists of Europe and America at the first words uttered against the idea that every communicating *intelligence* is necessarily the Spirit of some ex-mortal from this earth—has not said its last word about Spiritualism and Spirits. It may one day. Meanwhile an humble servant of theosophy, the Editor, declares once more her belief in Beings, grander, wiser, nobler than any *personal* God, who are beyond any "Spirits of the dead" Saints, or winged Angels, who, nevertheless, *do* condescend in all and every age to occasionally overshadow rare sensitives—often entirely unconnected with Church, Spiritualism or even Theosophy. And believing in high and holy Spiritual Beings, she must also believe in the existence of their opposites—lower "Spirits," good, bad and indifferent. Therefore does she believe in spiritualism and its phenomena, some of which are so repugnant to her.

This, as a casual remark and a digression, just to show that Theosophy includes Spiritualism—as it should be, not as it is—among its sciences, based on knowledge and the experience of countless ages. There is not a religion worthy of the name which has been started otherwise than in consequence of such *visits* from Beings on the higher planes.

Thus were born all prehistoric, as well as all the historic religions, Mazdeism and Brahmanism, Buddhism and Christianity, Judaism, Gnosticism and Mahommedanism; in short every more or less successful "ism." All are true at the bottom, and all are false on their surface. The Revealer, the artist who impressed a portion of the Truth on the brain of the Seer, was in every instance a true artist, who gave out genuine truths; but the instrument proved also, in every instance, to be *only a man.* Invite Rubenstein and ask him to play a sonata of Beethoven on a piano left to *self-tuning,* one half of the keys of which are in chronic paralysis, while the wires hang loose; then see whether, the genius of the artist notwithstanding, you will be able to recognize the sonata. The moral of the *fabula* is that a man—let him be the greatest of mediums or natural Seers—is but a man; and man left to his own devices and speculations *must* be out of tune with absolute truth, while even picking up some of the crumbs. For Man is but a *fallen* Angel, a god within, but having an animal brain in his head, more subject to cold and wine fumes while in company with other men on Earth, than to the faultless reception of divine revelations.

SOUL-DESTROYING DOGMA

If we at times speak bitterly of popular modern Christianity, it is because we know that, with all its other ennobling and saving tendencies, on this all-important point it leads to the destruction of myriads of souls. For it leads to the belief that it signifies little what a man does, if he only believes that his sins are forgiven him, and that by relying on the merits of Jesus Christ he may escape the vengeance of the Lord. But there is no anthropomorphic Lord, no vengeance, no forgiveness; there is simply the action of a natural law impressed on the universe by the Absolute, simply a question of balance of affinities; and they, whose deeds and general tendencies are earthly, go down in the scale, rarely, very rarely, to rise again in their own identities; while those in whom these tendencies are spiritual pass upwards. —H. P. BLAVATSKY.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Nazism Examined

The War Against the West, a comprehensive analysis of Nazi political theory and social "philosophy," has been written by Dr. Aurel Kolnai, a liberal Catholic of Jewish extraction. William MacDonald, reviewing the work in the New York *Times* for Aug. 28, observes that its importance "for an understanding of the ideology of National Socialism can hardly be overestimated." The reviewer notes the enormous amount of material Dr. Kolnai has perused in order to summarize the Nazi position, remarking that the views of the German writers quoted "are presented with scrupulous fairness." Mr. MacDonald's own summary of *The War Against the West* is of interest:

> What, then, is the ideology of the new Germany as conceived by the scores of writers whom Dr. Kolnai cites? The "moral charter" is the conception of the nation "as the ultimate standard of its own conduct"—a conception in which Dr. Kolnai sees a return to the tribal mind in which the community overshadows the individual and personality, and all who are not leaders are essentially servile. To the new nationalism, liberalism is the main adversary, and the reinstatement or recreation of tyranny is felt, in Dr. Kolnai's striking phrase, "as an enlivening emancipation of the soul of the entire community." The idea of leadership, on the other hand, is not that of absolute tyranny, but rather, in the case of Hitler at least, that of an incarnation of the German people.

"New Paganism"

> The totalitarian State, according to Dr. Kolnai, is neither democratic nor collectivist, but "the renewal of the tribal State at the stage of industrial civilization, organized by means of the social technique previously developed by the democratic State with its plurality of parties." To any non-tribal religion or ethics totalitarian politics is, of course, entirely opposed.
>
> A new paganism, not without religious intensity, is displacing Christianity, although the "Catholic auxiliaries" of Nazism, Dr. Kolnai points out, are "fairly numerous" notwithstanding doubts about their sincerity. The ideal of Nazi morals is historical greatness, and "the morals of greatness, ruthlessness, naked strength and efficiency pervade Nazi mentality at every point," while "the object of law is no longer to check but rather to encourage the arbitrary exertion of public power."

This, in short, is Nazism. Little comment is needed, except, perhaps, to suggest that students read once again H. P. B.'s allegorical article, "Karmic Visions," first printed in *Lucifer* for June 15, 1888—the very day on which Frederick III, Emperor of Germany, died of cancer of the *throat*. In *The Ocean of Theosophy*, Mr. Judge calls him a reincarnation of Clovis, the Merovingian king of the Franks, who remained a pagan until, according to Gregory of Tours, God helped him, like another Constantine, to win a battle over the Alamans in 496. For political reasons, Clovis became the champion of the "true faith" of Rome, and gradually established the great Frankish kingdom in Europe by the ruthless expedients of treachery and the assassination of his rivals.

St. John's Gospel—Nazi Version

It was to be expected, then, as Christianity had been adopted by the Germanic peoples in this fashion, that their liberation from the dogmas of the church would be occasioned by similar motives and means. The "new paganism" which is displacing Christianity finds expression in various ways. Nazi members of the Bremen Evangelical Church last year rewrote the Gospel of St. John to suit anti-Semitic sentiment. The new version fosters the theory that Jesus was of Teutonic stock and takes several liberties with the text—in itself a matter of little consequence in view of the exceedingly dubious literary history of the bible. Important, however, is the fact that the notion of individual immortality is "replaced by that of the worldly triumph of Nazi ideas." (London *Daily Telegraph*, April 1, 1937.) In thus denying immortality the Nazi "theologians" have adopted the position of the Jewish Moses, in whose Books no reference to a life after the death of the body can be found!

A fanatical campaigner in this war against immortality of the soul, against all religions, but particularly against those whom she calls "the priests of Tibet," is Frau Mathilde Ludendorff, widow of the late General of wartime fame, who died last December. At the annual *Parteitag* of the Nazis held in September at Nürnberg, center of anti-Semitism, she announced:

> The priests of Tibet are gradually conquering the world. Our German people must resist the temptations of these rulers of the Roof of the World whose aim is to make the Germans their slaves. (*Time*, Sept. 12.)

The *Time* writer, giving an account of the Nürnberg festivities, which included the fêting by some million and a half Germans of

"100 certified Jew-baiting Arabs brought especially from Palestine and Africa," remarks: "There is no evidence that Herr Hitler thinks Frau Lundendorff an eccentric." Her "philosophy" is disseminated among the German people by a fortnightly publication issued by the house of Ludendorff, entitled, *At the Sacred Fountain of German Strength.* Extracts translated from the issue of March 20, 1937, indicate the insidious character of the attacks on Theosophy which are being made today. Under the title of "The Hand of Supragovernmental Powers," General Ludendorff contends all western religions are derived from what he calls "Central Asiatic Occultism," tracing the influence of Eastern philosophy on western thought in a way that suggests more than a superficial familiarity with the facts as presented in the teaching. He opens his article with a quotation attributed to H. P. B., in which prediction is made that knowledge of the ancient "Mysteries" will be renewed among western peoples. He comments:

> In fact one of the strange things of the twentieth century is the spread in the Western world of Central Asiatic Occultism with greater strength than ever before, i.e., in Europe and the United States of America, . . . The Buddhist sacerdotal caste on the "Roof of the World" is the oldest of the sacerdotal castes existing in the world today.

Brotherhood Menaces Germany

The General proceeds to show how the Jews learned their mysteries in Egypt and Babylon, from sources originally Eastern; how Christianity borrowed wholesale from Hinduism and Buddhism, quoting Jacolliot to prove it; how the Rosicrucians spread Buddhist teachings; he claims a similar origin for Islam, concluding, "This religion of mankind is the same Theosophy which from India is being promulgated among the Christian nations. We see, therefore, how methodically the Central Asiatic Occultism proceeds." Indeed! A kick from Jupiter is sweet. In another article in the same issue, "The Voice of the Blood," General Ludendorff charges Christians and "occultists" of Buddhist origin with attempting to "intoxicate" the German nation by ascribing to it "a Pan-Aryan world commanding task," and lays down this fiat:

> However, we are not Christian, we are not universal, but German. We do not represent Christian, nor universal, but only German interests. The soul of the nation feels the dangers such influences represent for the German nation and gratefully accepts the enlightenment, which spells the salvation of the

> nation, emanating from the house of Ludendorff and to large extent from the philosopher Dr. Mathilde Ludendorff.

TEUTONIC PROPHETESS

Frau Ludendorff has, then, assumed responsibility for the guidance of the spiritual destinies of the German people. She is troubled by no uncertainties in doctrine. The future of Germany depends upon its emancipation from "Three Errors," the nature and consequences of which she examines in still another article in the publication above quoted. Briefly, the errors are, (1) belief in immortality of the soul, (2) the belief that conscience is an unerring guide to right action, whether as "the voice of God in man's soul," or deriving its authority from any other source than the contemporary external moral code, and (3) the belief that "a personal god, or personal gods, or fate of some kind, shape the life of individuals and of entire nations, and that it is possible to create a favorable destiny by all kinds of sacrifices, religious performances, prayers or practices."

It is of particular interest to note here the beliefs of an heretical Eastern sect, the Throndacians, founded by Paulicians of the province of Ararat early in the ninth century. According to Ignaz von Döllinger's *Contributions to the History of Mediaeval Sectarianism* (I, 27), the "secret teachings" of the Throndacians were:

> Rejection of all religions claiming to be revealed, negation of individual continuity after death and of the government of the world by divine providence, as well as of the difference between good and evil from the moral point of view.

One wonders whether Frau Ludendorff has been browsing in theological history, or perhaps was once a "Throndacian heretic" herself! We may hope, however, that the other Throndacians had a higher regard for the truth, for Frau Ludendorff indiscriminately identifies all religious philosophy—even the Wisdom-Religion of Theosophy—with the mercenary deceptions of priestcraft. The fact that Theosophy is as eager as herself to expose the error of a personal god or gods interests her not at all. She seems deliberately and most diabolically to have misrepresented Theosophy to her readers, wholly ignoring that priestly exploitation and external authority are exactly opposite to the teachings of the adepts. She says:

FRAU LUDENDORFF'S "FREEDOM"

> It is a sad fact, true beyond doubt, that neither the individual nor entire nations may ever hope to free themselves from the

tyranny of occult priests and all their fellow helpers unless they replace these dangerous false doctrines by the sacred reality. [That is, what Frau Lundendorff tells us to believe—and this, of course, is not priestcraft and dogma.] Freedom from the Christian doctrine therefore does not mean freedom from sacerdotal tyranny—all too often the individual remains completely enmeshed in these three errors and only exchanges one kind of priests for another kind. [The Nazi kind, perhaps?] With regard to his and his nation's freedom it is immaterial whether he allows Christian priests or Aryan, Buddhistic, anthroposophical or Theosophical Mahatmas, *i.e.,* wise men, to dominate and rule his soul or regards them as chiefs of an occult fraternity to which he pledges himself. Each of these sacerdotal castes presents the three indispensable props of their power in a somewhat modified form, but they all must hold on to the illusion of a personal life after death, to the illusion of the unerring wisdom of the voice of conscience, to the illusion of a shaping of fate before death by eternal divine powers.

What are the Facts?

Enough! Suffice it that the philosophy of Theosophy make its own answer to these calumnies. With respect to Frau Ludendorff's three "props," it teaches:

> (1) The Soul of man (*i.e.,* of the personality) *per se* is neither immortal, eternal nor divine. . . . We say that man and Soul have to conquer their immortality by ascending towards the unity with which, if successful, they will finally be linked and into which they are finally, so to speak, absorbed. The individualization of man after death depends on the spirit, not on his soul and body. Although the word "personality," in the sense in which it is usually understood, is an absurdity if applied literally to our immortal essence, still the latter is, as our individual Ego, a distinct entity, immortal and eternal, *per se.* (*The Key to Theosophy,* pp. 107, 103.)
>
> (2) The voice of conscience may be said to be Manas guided by Buddhi, but at the same time the Atman must also be concerned or there would be no real spiritual basis and no true certainty nor justice in the moving influence of conscience . . . its source is the Higher Self, and as it comes down through plane after plane it loses its force or retains power according to the life and education of the being on earth. The conscience of the savage is limited by his education just as were the consciences of the New Englander and European religionists who destroyed men for the sake of God and Christ. We cannot assert that the men who indulged in religious persecution were

not going according to what they called their conscience. By this I do not mean that conscience is a matter of education, but that the power of its utterances will be limited by our education, and consequently if we have a bigoted religion or a non-philosophical system we are likely to prevent ourselves from hearing our conscience. And in those cases where men are doing wrong according to what they call their conscience, it must be true that they have so warped their intuition as not to understand the voice of the inward monitor.—*W. Q. J.* (*The Theosophical Forum, December,* 1893, and November, 1894.)

(3) The Personal God of orthodox Theism perceives, thinks, and is affected by emotion; he repents and feels "fierce anger." But the notion of such mental states clearly involves the unthinkable postulates of the externality of exciting stimuli, to say nothing of the impossibility of ascribing changelessness to a Being whose emotions fluctuate with events in the world he presides over. The conceptions of a Personal God as changeless and infinite are thus unpsychological and, what is worse, unphilosophical . . . we connote by the word God, *not the crude anthropomorphism which is still the backbone of our current theology, but the symbolic conception of that which is Life and Motion of the Universe.* . . . It is not the One Unknown ever-present God in Nature, or Nature *in abscondito,* that is rejected, but the God of human dogma and his *humanized* "Word." In his infinite conceit and inherent pride and vanity, man shaped it himself with his sacrilegious hand out of the material he found in his own small brain-fabric, and forced it on mankind as a direct revelation from the one unrevealed SPACE. (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 2 fn.; 3 fn.; 9.)

KARMA OF "SPORT"

The August *Statistical Bulletin* of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company reports that about 1,000 persons are killed annually through the carelessness of "sportsmen" who have obtained licenses to hunt wild animals with firearms. While nearly 3,000 persons die each year from wounds in firearm accidents generally, this third of the total number of fatal shooting accidents occur in the field. "Hundreds more," says the *Bulletin,* "are killed annually by firearms while preparing for the hunt—cleaning guns, at target practice, etc. In the hands of children, hunters' guns carelessly left around the home have far too often figured in tragedies." A degree of insight into the Karma of some of these fatalities is provided by an analysis of the records of 133 deaths in typical shooting accidents on the hunt, which we summarize:

> The fatalities fall mainly into three classes: (*a*) Deaths from wounds accidentally self-inflicted, which accounted for a total of 60, or 45 per cent; (*b*) deaths caused by accidental shooting by a hunting companion, of which there were 48, or 36 per cent, and (*c*) deaths from wounds inflicted by hunters in other parties, which totalled 19, or 14 per cent. Nine of the latter were mistaken for game, while others were killed by stray bullets or because they stepped suddenly into a line of fire of another's gun.

Evidently all but six of these 133 persons killed by hunters were themselves hunters, a fact which, while not exactly poetic, is certainly justice. The *Bulletin* observes, "Not until hunters become more careful in the handling of guns and realize the dangers involved can we expect a decline in accidental hunting deaths." A surer way would be for human beings to become more careful of life, animal and human, and stop hunting altogether.

Ethics of Materialism

The "Anthropologist's Credo" of Franz Boas was published in *The Nation* for August 27 as one of a series of presentations of "Living Philosophies." The reflections of Prof. Boas are interesting, not only because he is perhaps the leading anthropologist in the United States, but also because of the curious dichotomy of thought which typifies the philosophizing of most of the exponents of the social sciences. He is able, on the one hand, to deny there is a purposive scheme underlying natural phenomena, to affirm that we think ourselves free to choose our own actions only because we are unable to trace the causes which really determine the choices we make, and that freedom, therefore, is only apparent; while on the other hand he observes that his whole outlook on social life is determined by the question: "How can we recognize the shackles that tradition has laid upon us? For when we recognize them, we are also able to break them." One might suggest that we begin by recognizing materialism as the worst shackle of scientific thought.

Prof. Boas distinguishes between the fundamental conceptions of *good* and *bad,* and the constantly changing forms which men's ideas of good and bad take. He considers the sense of moral responsibility as expressed in the words, "must," and "ought," to be universal among mankind. These persisting forms of human thought are precisely what differentiate man from all animals, yet Prof. Boas derives the ethical behavior of man from the animal kingdom —"a further development of the herd instinct of higher animals, which also hold together as a group, offering protection to one

another and aggressive hostility to other groups which are potential rivals for food supply or are enemies of the species." Ethical evolution, he holds, involves the enlargement of the group to include outsiders. "The great ethical leaders of all times," he observes, "have expanded the group to embrace all humanity, because they saw that the primitive concept of specific differences between the in-group and the outsider is not valid."

CURIOUS CONTRADICTION

The student of Theosophy would be interested to have Prof. Boas give examples of ethical leaders among the "higher animals," from whom this common striving of all great humans must have been developed, according to his theory. We have yet to find a wolf advocating brotherly love toward the lamb. This conscious expansion of the idea of self is another distinctive quality of the human kingdom.

One wonders if Prof. Boas really believes that some primeval tendency in the germ plasm of his ancestral stock causes him to say:

> It is my conviction that the fundamental ethical point of view is that of the in-group, which must be expanded to include all humanity. . . .
>
> It is one of the curious phenomena of our time that intellectual and spiritual freedom is confused with social and economic freedom. . . .
>
> It is, . . . intolerable that the state should force a person to actions that are against his intellectual or spiritual principles.

LIGHTNING STRIKES TWICE

On Aug. 5, 1913, about 3:15 P.M., John A. Maxwell, an undertaker of Somerville, N. J., was knocked to the ground by a bolt of lightning while playing golf on a local course. (New York *Times*, Aug 12.) Two other players and three caddies were affected in the same way, although no one was injured. Twenty-five years later, on Aug. 11 of this year, Mr. Maxwell, then sixty-two years old, was in the same place on the course—the tenth fairway—when a sudden shower blew up. The time was also the same: about 3:15 in the afternoon. Without warning a bolt of lightning struck him in the back, killing him instantly. A caddy, standing nearby, was only stunned. According to an employe at the Maxwell establishment, Mr. Maxwell often told of his narrow escape in 1913, always asserting that he was "scared to death" of lightning and would "run at the first sign of it."

This event constitutes a curious illustration of Karmic destiny, implying a destructive relation with the element of fire, in which the attractive power of fear was involved. Apparently, lightning *does* strike in the same place, under the intelligent necessities of retributive justice.

Our Doubtful "Free Press"

The few remaining democratic countries often virtuously boast of their "free press," but experience teaches that the press is not free enough to print truths which might offend the prejudices of influential advertisers and subscribers—especially religious subscribers. Most newspapers, for example, devote space to "Letters to the Editor," which voice the views of readers on topics of current interest. However, letters that expose the falsity of widely held religious dogmas seldom appear, although many are sent in. Books which reveal too clearly the evils in religious sects with numerous adherents are usually glossed over or ignored by reviewers, and devoted followers are found threatening book-sellers with withdrawal of patronage if they persist in selling such books. The tactics of the Christian Scientists in their attempts to suppress unpalatable biographies of Mrs. Eddy are an illustration of this. *Time* for Sept. 5 gives another example of the suppressive methods of organized religion. The news magazine, of course, makes no comment, giving only the facts:

Voltaire No Atheist

> The Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office is the awesome tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church which guards the integrity of Catholic faith and morals, deals with heresies (it once had charge of the Inquisition), handles mixed marriage cases, maintains the dread Index of Prohibited Books. So potent is the Holy Office that it is nominally headed, not by a Cardinal, like other congregations, but the Pope himself. Last week the Holy Office—with or without the knowledge of Pope Pius XI—was in the centre of a holy row, kicked up by a devoted but back-boned British convert to Catholicism, Poet Alfred Noyes.
>
> Two years ago Alfred Noyes, a Catholic of eleven years' standing, wrote an able biography, *Voltaire,* published in the U. S. and England by Sheed & Ward, a distinguished Catholic firm. Author Noyes made no attempt to whitewash the corruptions, ecclesiastical and otherwise, of Voltaire's time; he agreed with Voltaire's observation that "to receive the Host from certain hands would be like swallowing a spider." Author Noyes

did aim, however, to prove by Voltaire's own statements that he was by no means the cynical atheist he is commonly considered; that he was, in fact, a Deist without quite enough insight to become a full Christian. *Voltaire,* thought its author, presents an "overwhelming" case for Christianity. The Holy Office when it read the book last spring, thought otherwise. Its secretary, Donatus Cardinal Sbarretti, wrote Arthur Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster, that the Holy Office decreed:

"That the author be informed that the book be found worthy of condemnation by the Holy Office, but that such could be avoided if he removes, as far as he is able, all copies from circulation, and at the same time writes something that will be equivalent to a reparation. That the publishers be severely warned for having published the book, and that they withdraw it from sale."

SUBMISSIVE PUBLISHERS

Sheed & Ward, mindful of their Catholic public, withdrew *Voltaire* from British and U. S. circulation. A French Catholic firm, which had ready a translation of the book, held up publication. Meanwhile, Author Noyes sought to learn why the Holy Office thought *Voltaire* worthy of condemnation. He was informed that he would be told only if he would write the Holy Office a letter, which, by implication, would acknowledge his errors. Unwilling to make any such blind recantation, Author Noyes did what Englishmen often do when highly irritated. He appealed to the London *Times,* which last fortnight printed the documents of the case, including the Holy Office letter.

Mr. Noyes wrote to Cardinal Hinsley:

"So far as I know, it is the first time in history that any English writer of any standing, or indeed any English writer who in his work—whatever his personal failures may be—has reverenced 'conscience as his king,' has had such an order addressed to him in such terms."

This is but one case brought to light, typical, no doubt, of many others involving writers less courageous and less conscientious than Mr. Noyes. Students of Theosophy would do well to re-read H. P. B.'s article, "Theosophy or Jesuitism" (THEOSOPHY IV, 453), as giving light on such incidents as this, and providing also some hints as to the future.

Teachers Like History

"History is the favorite subject with applicants for a teacher's license in the New York City schools," notes the writer of "Topics of the Times." (New York *Times,* Sept. 27.) It appears that the so-called "controversial" subjects—history, economics and sociology—are preferred to definite subjects like mathematics and languages. Why?

> There is an obvious reason why so many people today are eager to teach history and civics and economics and sociology. It is that there are so many boys and girls eager to learn something about these subjects. Youth wants information precisely because these subjects are controversial. Youth wants light, guidance, the truth. Youth stands there with minds to be filled; and, inasmuch as teachers are part of that Nature which abhors a vacuum, teachers rush in to fill the empty space.

Nothing to Teach

The writer observes that while more and more people are anxious to teach history, fewer and fewer believe there is anything to teach. A growing school of thought takes for its text the epigram of Heine: "The only thing we learn from history is that men never learn anything from history." Yet—

> Youth wants to know something about sociology, the science of society, in this era of social change. But what can the school teachers in economics and sociology teach the boys and girls other than that economics and sociology may be pretty nearly anything you like?

The commentator proceeds to point out that this complete relativism of knowledge, of values, is a direct outcome of modern philosophy.

> . . . that is exactly what modern pragmatism or instrumentalism was teaching us a generation ago and the new ideologists have carried it to the limit. Human knowledge is whatever you find necessary in your business. The history of a nation is what the dominant social class at any moment chooses to make it. As classes and class views change the history of that nation's past is rewritten.
>
> When the Communists take charge of Russia in 1918 they proceed to change Russia's past to suit their purposes. And when inside the Communist regime Stalin declares war on Trotsky and crushes him the history of Russia as recently as 1918 is rewritten so as to dispose of Trotsky. Hitler rewrites anthropology to build himself a race theory of hate, and in

> accordance with this theory the universities must teach and the artists must create and the thinkers must think. But in a milder form than Communism and Nazism men everywhere have been asserting the relativity, the instrumentality of knowledge. Here, at home we have been told for some time that capitalism is an expression of Protestant individualism, and the doctrines of Adam Smith were shaped by British interests in the eighteenth century.
>
> History, economics, sociology—everything is instrumental, ideological. You pick out your party to enroll with and then get fitted out with the appropriate history, economics and sociology. That seems to be the present-day trend. What else will the history teachers teach New York's boys and girls?

DOES PRAGMATISM PAY?

In a trenchant essay on the tendencies of modern thought, Be trand Russell called Pragmatism the doctrine that "Truth is wha it pays to believe." In consideration of the evidence assembled b the *Times* writer, the question is in order: Does Pragmatism pay Some prophetic words of Robert Crosbie are appropriate in th connection:

> Until men understand that they are not here for once, that whatever they receive they have merited, we shall have just as much and worse trouble than that we have already had, for the longer it goes on the more intense will be the reactions. But, perhaps men will listen to these obvious self-evident truths only when there has been such an absolute subversion and destruction that they have to stop and think.

The Karma that must be faced by iconoclastic and materializin intellectuals who, although their personal lives may often be beyon reproach, are nevertheless largely responsible for the animalizin ideas abroad in the world, is an unenviable lot. "Many men hav arisen who had glimpses of the truth, and fancied they had it all, wrote H. P. B. in the closing chapter of *Isis Unveiled*. There truth in the pragmatic doctrine that all human knowledge is relativ —relative to the use made of it by the human being; but this is no the whole truth. There are the ever-changing appearances, but ther is also reality behind: "By those who see the truth and look int the principles of things, the ultimate characteristic of *these bot* is seen."